

IN THE COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AT MUMBAI**ORDER BELOW EXHIBIT NO.12
IN
OBSTRUCTIONIST NOTICE NO.232 OF 2018
IN
T.E. & R. SUIT NO.268/291 OF 2003**

1. Shri. Tilak Khetshi Shah & Anr. **Plaintiffs**

Versus

B. Shantilal & Co. **Defendants**

And

1. Vipul Dhansukhlal Sanghvi & Ors. **Obstructionists**

Coram :- O.S.Patil
Judge, C.R.No.19
Date :- 11/06/2019

ORAL ORDER :

Perused the application and affidavit in reply (Exhibit 14). Heard both side. Learned counsel for the obstructionist argued that the plaintiff has not filed proper application. Prayer clause is also missing in this application. Hence, he requests to reject this application. But the proposed amendment is technical one. The plaintiff wants to correct the names of obstructionist No.2 and 4. Therefore to avoid further delay in this matter I deem it fit to allow this application. For, no prejudice would cause to the other side and the nature of proceeding would not change, if this application is allowed. Hence, this application is allowed. The

plaintiff directed to carry out amendment and serve copy of amended
plaint to the other side as early as possible.

Dt. 11/06/2019

[O.S.Patil]
Judge, C.R.No.19